

To: Dreyfus, Melissa G.[Dreyfus.Melissa@epa.gov]
From: Dreyfus, Melissa G.
Sent: Thur 8/13/2015 9:49:15 PM
Subject: Fw: Additional Superfund Qs

From: Schlieger, Brian
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 4:04 PM
To: EOC Technical Specialist
Cc: EOC OGC
Subject: Re: Additional Superfund Qs

Attorney Client/Ex. 5

From: Dreyfus, Melissa G. on behalf of EOC Technical Specialist
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 3:37 PM
To: Schlieger, Brian
Subject: Fw: Additional Superfund Qs

Brian,

the last question is the one about whether Superfund would cover an expense such as a water treatment plant.

thanks

From: Thomas, Latosha

Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 12:26 PM
To: EOC Technical Specialist
Subject: Fw: Additional Superfund Qs

Hi,

These are a subset of questions from Associated Press re: Superfund and the spill. Thanks!

From: Senn, John on behalf of EOC Public Information
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 12:14 PM
To: Thomas, Latosha
Subject: Additional Superfund Qs

--had Gold King Mine been designated a Superfund site, what would have been the chances of the spill happening?

--how many mines are currently on the National Priorities List? Can we get a list of those or is there a way to search on the Superfund website?

--is there a gauge of how often resistance to a Superfund designation by local officials has prevented a site's listing?

-was a preliminary assessment ever completed on the Gold King Mine or for a group of mines including Gold King?

--it's my understanding that the EPA has said a water treatment plant estimated to cost \$12-\$17m (and \$1M a year to operate) would be able to clean the water in the Animas. Is that correct? And if so, is it the type of expense that Superfund would cover?